



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,424	07/05/2006	Jeff Chen	05-931-F	6678
63572 7590 09/06/2011 MCDONNELL BOEHNNEN HULBERT @ BERGHOFF LLP 300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE SUITE 3100 CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER JEAN-LOUIS, SAMIRA JM				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1627				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/06/2011		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/552,424

**Applicant(s)**

CHEN ET AL.

**Examiner**

SAMIRA JEAN-LOUIS

**Art Unit**

1627

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 04 August 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  
 NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-3 and 7-9.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See continuation sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/SREENI PADMANABHAN/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1627

The Examiner acknowledges receipt of applicant's amendment filed on 08/04/11. However, such amendment will not be entered as the addition of new claims would require further consideration and search.

While applicant's amendment would obviate the 102(e) rejection over Biwersi et al., the Examiner contends that Biwersi still renders obvious claims 1-3 and 7-9. While R3 is now recited as an alkyl, the Examiner contends that substitution of an alkyl for a hydrogen is obvious absent unexpected results. It is generally noted that the substitution of methyl for hydrogen on a known compound is not a patentable modification absent unexpected or unobvious results. In re Lincoln, 126 U.S.P.Q. 477, 53 U.S. P.Q. 40 (C.C.P.A. 1942); In re Druey, 319 F.2d 237, 138 U.S.P.Q. 39 (C.C. P.A. 1963); In re Lohr, 317 F.2d 388, 137 U.S.P.Q. 548 (C.C.P.A. 1963); In re Hoehsema, 399 F.2d 269, 158 U.S.P.Q. 598 (C.C.P.A. 1968); In re Wood, 582 F.2d 638, 199 U.S. P.Q. 137 (C.C.P.A. 1978); In re Hoke, 560 F.2d 436, 195 U.S.P.Q. 148 (C.C.P.A.A. 1977); Ex parte Fauque, 121 U.S.P.Q. 425 (P.O.B.A. 1954); Ex parte Henkel, 130 U.S.P.Q. 474, (P.O.B.A. 1960). Given that applicant did not provide unexpected or unobvious results of the invention, it is concluded that the normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known would provide the motivation to substitute the "H" group to a "methyl" group.

For the foregoing reasons, the Examiner contends that Biwersi et al. still render obvious applicant's invention. Consequently, the rejections of record were indeed proper and are therefore maintained.